



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,666	09/25/2001	Rudolf Kodes	1454.1079	6964

21171 7590 09/16/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

THANGAVELU, KANDASAMY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2123

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/889,666

Applicant(s)

KODES, RUDOLF

Examiner

Kandasamy Thangavelu

Art Unit

2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-13 and 15-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-13 and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11 July 2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the Applicant's Response mailed on July 11, 2005. Claim 14 was canceled. Claims 1 and 13 were amended. Claims 1, 3-13 and 15-20 of the application are pending. This office action is made final.

Drawings

2. The drawings submitted on September 25, 2001 are objected to:

Figure 1 does not show a portion of a complex process model for a technical system, as claimed. There are no technical system, no components of the technical system and no process model in the figure. What it shows are a lot of lines, a few arrows, one block with words and some additional words. One of ordinary skill in the art will not recognize it as part of the process model of a technical system.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 4, Para 0030 states, "Fig. 1 shows a portion of a complex process model for a technical system. ... An arrow at the end of a line signifies an orientation of the same". The Examiner takes the position that Fig. 1 does not show a portion of a complex process model for a technical system. There are no technical system, no

Art Unit: 2123

components of the technical system and no process model in the figure. It is not clear as to what the applicant meant by the orientation of the same. Paragraph 0013 of the specification does not say what orientation is.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1, 3-13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

5.1 Claim 1 states in part, “connecting a first unit of an engineering process to a set of second units of the engineering process in a predefined fashion; and determining at least one third unit of the engineering process from the set of second units which has a predefined relationship with the first unit”. The specification does not describe anywhere what is meant by “predefined fashion” and “predefined relationship”. The specification does not describe what is a first unit, what is a

Art Unit: 2123

second unit and what is a third unit and what are the criteria to classify the units as the first, second and the third units.

5.2 Claim 4 states in part, “the at least one third element fulfils a predefined connection criterion to the first unit”. The specification does not describe anywhere what is the predefined connection criterion and how it is selected or specified.

5.3 Claim 6 states in part, “the first unit is used to represent *only the at least one third unit* which is a predecessor of the first unit”. The specification does not describe why the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit and how it represents only the at least one third unit.

5.4 Claim 7 states in part, “the first unit is used to represent *only the at least one third unit* which is a successor of the first unit”. The specification does not describe why the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit and how it represents only the at least one third unit.

5.5 Claim 12 states in part, “the units are used to design a technical system”. The specification does not describe anywhere how the units are used to design the technical system.

5.6 Claim 13 states in part, “a first unit of an engineering process connected to a set of second units of the engineering process in a predefined fashion; and at least one third unit of the

Art Unit: 2123

engineering process determined from the set of second units which has a predefined relationship with the first unit". The specification does not describe anywhere what is meant by "predefined fashion" and "predefined relationship". The specification does not describe what is a first unit, what is a second unit and what is a third unit and what are the criteria to classify the units as the first, second and the third units.

5.7 Claim 15 states in part, "the at least one third element fulfils a predefined connection criterion to the first unit". The specification does not describe anywhere what is the predefined connection criterion and how it is selected or specified.

5.8 Claim 17 states in part, "the first unit is used to represent *only the at least one third unit* which is a predecessor of the first unit". The specification does not describe why the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit and how it represents only the at least one third unit.

5.9 Claim 18 states in part, "the first unit is used to represent *only the at least one third unit* which is a successor of the first unit". The specification does not describe why the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit and how it represents only the at least one third unit.

Claims rejected but not specifically addressed are rejected based on their dependency on rejected claims.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1, 3-13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7.1 Claim 1 states in part, "A preprocessing method", "a first unit", "a set of second units", "one third unit" and "carrying out structural preparation". These are broad terms used with no scope limitations. Therefore the examiner has assumed wide interpretations for the same as required by law.

The applicant has amended the claim to limit the first, second and third units to "a first unit of an engineering process", "a set of second units of the engineering process", and "one third unit of the engineering process". But how is the engineering process defined? It could be a design process, a manufacturing process, an installation process, a testing process, an operating process, a maintenance process or a re-engineering process. The units could be the components and tools used in the process or the components and tools produced by the process or the data used or generated by the process. Since the claim does not limit the units to anything, the Examiner has difficulty in understanding as to what the applicant is attempting to claim. The terms "A preprocessing method", "first unit", "second units", "third unit" and "carrying out structural preparation" are undefined, making the claim vague and indefinite.

7.2 Claim 4 states in part, “at least one third element fulfils a predefined connection criterion to the first unit”. The term “a predefined connection criterion” is undefined, making the claim vague and indefinite.

7.3 Claim 5 states in part, “the units have an orientation with respect to one another”. The term orientation is undefined, making the claim vague and indefinite.

7.4 Claim 13 states in part, “A processing system”, “a first unit”, “a set of second units”, “one third unit” and “carrying out structural preparation”. The terms “A preprocessing system”, “first unit”, “second units”, “third unit” and “carrying out structural preparation” are undefined, making the claim vague and indefinite.

7.5 Claim 15 states in part, “at least one third element fulfils a predefined connection criterion to the first unit”. The term “a predefined connection criterion” is undefined, making the claim vague and indefinite.

7.6 Claim 16 states in part, “the units have an orientation with respect to one another”. The term orientation is undefined, making the claim vague and indefinite.

Claims rejected but not specifically addressed are rejected based on their dependency on rejected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

9. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 12-3, 15-16 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by **Hershey et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,375,070).

9.1 **Hershey et al.** teaches information collection architecture and method for a data communication network. Specifically, as per claim 1, **Hershey et al.** teaches a preprocessing method (CL2, L7-9); comprising:

connecting a first unit of an engineering process (record of all frames) to a set of second units of the engineering process (time stamps) in a predefined fashion (CL1, L40-46);

determining at least one third unit of the engineering process (statistical information) from the set of second units which has a predefined relationship with the first unit (frames) (CL1, L47-56; CL4, L12-15); and

Art Unit: 2123

carrying out structural preparation (statistical information collection) of the at least one third unit as preprocessing (CL1, L52-56; CL2, L7-13; CL4, L31-40).

Per claim 3: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the structural preparation is carried out by representing a shortened connection to the first unit (CL1, L52-56).

Per claim 4: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the at least one third element fulfils a predefined connection criterion to the first unit (CL1, L54-56).

Per claim 5: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the units have an orientation with respect to one another (CL1, L40-56).

Per claim 8: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the at least one third unit is indicated with a short connection to the first unit (CL1, L52-56).

Per claim 9: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the units are information, in particular activities and/or results of the activities (CL1, L8-10; CL1, L37-68; CL2, L10-13).

Per claim 12: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the units are used to design a technical system (CL2, L65-66; CL4, L36-37).

Art Unit: 2123

9.2 As per claim 13, **Hershey et al.** teaches a processing arrangement, having a processing unit (CL3, L55-62); comprising:

a first unit of an engineering process connected to a set of second units of the engineering process in a predefined fashion (CL1, L40-46);

at least one third unit of the engineering process determined from the set of second units which has a predefined relationship with the first unit (CL1, L47-56; CL4, L12-15); and

a structural preparation of the at least one third unit being carried out as preprocessing (CL1, L52-56; CL2, L7-13; CL4, L31-40).

Per claim 15: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the at least one third element fulfils a predefined connection criterion to the first unit (CL1, L54-56).

Per claim 16: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the units have an orientation with respect to one another (CL1, L40-56).

Per claim 19: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the at least one third unit is indicated with a short connection to the first unit (CL1, L52-56).

Per claim 20: **Hershey et al.** teaches that the units are information, in particular activities and/or results of the activities (CL1, L8-10; CL1, L37-68; CL2, L10-13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. Claims 6-7, 10-11 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hershey et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,375,070) in view of **Minami et al.** (U.S. Patent application 2002/0042810).

12.1 As per claim 6, **Hershey et al.** teaches the method of claim 1. **Hershey et al.** does not expressly teach that the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit which is a predecessor of the first unit. **Minami et al.** teaches that the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit which is a predecessor of the first unit (Page 2, Para 0019), because the

Art Unit: 2123

predecessor has link information relative the first activity (Page 2, Para 0019). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the method of **Hershey et al.** with the method of **Minami et al.** that included the first unit being used to represent only the at least one third unit which was a predecessor of the first unit. The artisan would have been motivated because the predecessor would have link information relative the first activity.

12.2 As per claim 7, **Hershey et al.** teaches the method of claim 1. **Hershey et al.** does not expressly teach that the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit which is a successor of the first unit. **Minami et al.** teaches that the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit which is a successor of the first unit (Page 2, Para 0019; Page 3, Para 0028), because the successor has link information relative the second activity (Page 2, Para 0019). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the method of **Hershey et al.** with the method of **Minami et al.** that included the first unit being used to represent only the at least one third unit which was a successor of the first unit. The artisan would have been motivated because the successor would have link information relative the second activity.

12.3 As per claim 10, **Hershey et al.** teaches the method of claim 1. **Hershey et al.** does not expressly teach visualizing a technical system or a portion thereof. **Minami et al.** teaches visualizing a technical system or a portion thereof (Fig. 9-11), because that will enable a user to easily perform the development of the system (Page 7, Para 0100). It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2123

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the method of **Hershey et al.** with the method of **Minami et al.** that included visualizing a technical system or a portion thereof. The artisan would have been motivated because that would enable a user to easily perform the development of the system.

12.4 As per claim 11, **Hershey et al.** teaches the method of claim 1. **Hershey et al.** does not expressly teach that the representation is effected by means of actuation using a context-sensitive menu. **Minami et al.** teaches that the representation is effected by means of actuation using a context-sensitive menu (Fig. 9-11; Page 7, Para 0102-0108), because that will enable a user to easily perform the development of the system (Page 7, Para 0100). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the method of **Hershey et al.** with the method of **Minami et al.** that included the representation being effected by means of actuation using a context-sensitive menu. The artisan would have been motivated because that would enable a user to easily perform the development of the system.

12.5 As per claim 17, **Hershey et al.** teaches the method of claim 5. **Hershey et al.** does not expressly teach that the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit which is a predecessor of the first unit. **Minami et al.** teaches that the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit which is a predecessor of the first unit (Page 2, Para 0019), because the predecessor has link information relative the first activity (Page 2, Para 0019). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the method of **Hershey et al.** with the method of **Minami et al.** that included the first unit being

Art Unit: 2123

used to represent only the at least one third unit which was a predecessor of the first unit. The artisan would have been motivated because the predecessor would have link information relative the first activity.

12.6 As per claim 18, **Hershey et al.** and **Minami et al.** teach the method of claim 6.

Hershey et al. does not expressly teach that the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit which is a successor of the first unit. **Minami et al.** teaches that the first unit is used to represent only the at least one third unit which is a successor of the first unit (Page 2, Para 0019; Page 3, Para 0028), because the successor has link information relative the second activity (Page 2, Para 0019). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the method of **Hershey et al.** with the method of **Minami et al.** that included the first unit being used to represent only the at least one third unit which was a successor of the first unit. The artisan would have been motivated because the successor would have link information relative the second activity.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed on July 11, 2005 have been fully considered. The arguments with respect to 35 USC 112 First Paragraph, 35 USC 112 Second Paragraph, 35 USC 102 (e) and 35 USC 103 (a) rejections are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2123

13.1 As per the applicant's argument that "the Examiner asserts that Fig. 1 does not show a portion of a complex process model for a technical system; the Examiner questions what is meant by the term "orientation" in paragraph 0030 of the specification; the Examiner rejects the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, raising various questions about the terms in the claims; the Examiner is referred to the Processing Modelling Guide and the Overview of Process Modelling; the Processing Modelling Guide shows that the technical terms used in the application were thoroughly explained back in 1996; one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the descriptive modeling subject matter of the present application; one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the pre-processing method and system to which the present invention is directed", the examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Processing modeling Guide provided with the IDS does not thoroughly explain the ^{terms} ~~terms~~ "preprocessing", "first unit", "second unit", "third unit", "orientation", "predefined fashion", "predefined relationship", and "structural preparation". Therefore, all these terms are **vague and indefinite**. One of ordinary skill in the art would **not** have understood the descriptive modeling subject matter of the present invention, since the specification does not mention "descriptive modeling".

13.2 As per the applicant's argument that "For Fig. 1, the Examiner asserts that it shows a lot of lines, a few arrows, but does not show a portion of a complex process model for technical systems; the references describe how lines and arrows are used to model a technical system; the Examiner is referred to the Process Structure section of the Processing Modelling Guide; in

Art Unit: 2123

addition, the Examiner is referred to the specification.”, the examiner takes the position that the specification does not fill the deficiency in Fig.1 in anyway. Additionally, the applicant is reminded that the Examiner is not expected to interpret Fig.1 from what is in an IDS document unless the Applicant provided the relationship between the Fig.1 and a corresponding element in the IDS document, in the specification and incorporated the IDS document by reference.

13.3 As per the applicants’ argument that “the Examiner questions the meaning of "orientation" in paragraph 0030; this term is defined in the application at paragraph 0013; "Orientation" shows a showing of a cause-and-effect relationship; Paragraph 0013 states that "A connection of activities and results such that orientation occurs from which it is apparent, inter alia, that an activity leads to a result and this result, if appropriate, again permits another activity"”, the examiner takes the position that orientation is not defined in Paragraph 0013 of the specification. The statement that “orientation shows a showing of a cause-and-effect relationship” is new material provided in the applicant’s argument but not found anywhere in the specification.

13.4 As per the applicants’ argument that “the Examiner questions what is meant by the "predefined relationship"; Paragraph 0046 of the specification describes a causal relationship; Paragraph 0039 of the specification describes Fig. 4 of the application and conveys that the predefined relationship depends on the specific process being modeled and the cause effect relationships within that process”, the examiner takes the position that Paragraph 0046 of the specification does not describe casual relationship or predefined relationship; Paragraph 0039

Art Unit: 2123

does not convey that the predefined relationship depends on the specification process being modeled and the cause effect relationships within that process.

13.5 As per the applicants' argument that "the claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; it is believed that a plurality of the objections raised in item 9 will be overcome with a more thorough understanding of the invention; with regard to item 9.1, the Examiner questions terms such as "units"; the claims have been amended to clarify that the units are units of an engineering process; the Examiner also questions what is meant by "a predefined connection criterion," and "an orientation"; in view of the above discussed specification excerpts, it is submitted that these terms are now clear", the examiner takes the position that the terms "first unit", "second unit", "third unit", "predefined connection criterion" and "orientation" have not been made clear in the specification or in the claims as originally submitted and are not yet clear even after the claim amendments made by the applicant.

13.6 As per the applicants' argument that "the Examiner is referred to the enclosed Overview of Process Modeling; this reference clarifies the difference between descriptive modeling and active modeling, and this is one of the differences between the subject matter of the application and the subject matter of Hershey et al.; the subject of the present application is in the area of descriptive modeling, whereas the subject of Hershey et al. is in the area of active modeling; Hershey et al. does not relate to "units of an engineering process" and a method and system for preprocessing to sort complicated activities which are carried out by a mobile agent with the aid of a template. ... Minami et al. does not compensate for the deficiencies discussed above with

Art Unit: 2123

regard to Hershey et al; Minami et al. contains no suggestions for "units for an engineering process" as claimed", the examiner takes the position that the terms "descriptive modeling" and "active modeling" are not described in the original specification. Since the applicant used various terms broadly, the Examiner has used broad interpretation of the terms within the engineering context. In addition, the applicant has not restricted his "units of an engineering process" only to the units that are not mobile.

Conclusion

ACTION IS FINAL

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim rejections are not persuasive. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2123


15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kandasamy Thangavelu whose telephone number is 571-272-3717. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached on 571-272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

K. Thangavelu
Art Unit 2123
September 10, 2005


Paul L. Rodriguez 9/13/05
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2125